



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,558	06/29/2001	Moo Jong Lim	8733.461.00	5058

30827 7590 03/12/2003

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER
----------

CHOI, JACOB Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/893,558

Applicant(s)

LIM, MOO JONG

Examiner

Jacob Y Choi

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano et al. (USPN 6,404,131) in view of Satoh (USPN 6,315,440).

Regarding claims 1, 5, 9 & 10 Kawano et al. discloses a light guiding plate (22), a reflection plate (23), and a diffusion plate (12), the backlight unit using LED (2a) as a back light lamp following a field sequence, wherein a plurality of lamps are arranged such that LED chips realizing R, G, and B colors are built in the respective lamp unit (Figure 18, 19), wherein the unit chips are turned on/of according to a sequence of a R chip, a G chip, and a B chip in each of the rows. Satoh teaches that it is known to modify a backlight liquid crystal display with LED chips containing R, G, and B colors as a set. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify backlight of Kawano et al. to utilize for a liquid crystal display, as taught by Satoh in order to illuminate LCD using LEDs containing R, G, and B colors (white light LED). In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LED chips

containing R, G, and B colors as a one lamp, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in several pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

Regarding claims 2 & 6 Kawano et al. in view of Satoh discloses the claimed invention, explained above. In addition, it is inherent that LED lamps has a luminescent area over 100 degrees.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 7 & 8 Kawano et al. in view of Satoh discloses the claimed invention, explained above. In addition, Kawano et al. discloses a tight fit between the lamps and the diffusion plate. It would have been obvious matter of design variation to disclose a specific intervals / distance between LEDs and the diffusion plate, since applicant has not disclosed that specific interval / distance solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well without the specific interval / distance.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. An argument filed on 12/09/2002 responds to the Office Action is not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2875

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, LED chips containing R, G, & B colors are built in the respective lamp may be utilized to teachings of Kawano et al. is obvious because functionality of both light-guiding plate of Satoh and diffusing plate of Kawano et al. are similar in a sense that mentioned plate diffuses / distributes light to emit a display. "Light-guiding" could be equated to "diffusing plate", therefore the combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art is proper. In addition, mentioned reference clearly discloses the combined R, G, & B colored light source.

In response to applicant's arguments against Kawano et al. in view of Satoh does not have a luminescent area over 100 degrees, examiner disagrees. Commonly used LED light source most definitely covers a luminescent area over 100 degrees, if this is not inherent then it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### **Conclusion**


4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Y Choi whose telephone number is (703) 308-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (703) 305-4939. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-7724.

  
Sandra O'Shea  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800

Application/Control Number: 09/893,558

Page 6

Art Unit: 2875

JC

March 10, 2003